

### REMARKS

In response to the office action dated January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2008, Applicant is amending independent claims 1, 12, and 14. As such, claims 1-20 are pending. Applicant submits that the claims as amended are allowable over the prior art of record. Favorable reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 12 and 14 are being amended to recite that a selectable command identifies the other electronic document. Support for the amendment can be found throughout the present disclosure. For example, it is described with reference to FIGS. 1A-1D that "Rather, the menu 160 indicates that the activity record 180 is a follow-up of the sales order and that the opportunity record 120 is a follow-up of the currently displayed activity record 180" (Specification 7:14-16). Additionally, Claims 1, 12, and 14 are being amended to remove the language "and not with at least one unassociated document among multiple electronic documents."

No new matter is added.

### **Claim rejections**

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement due to the term "unassociated document". Without conceding that the rejection has merit, and to further prosecution, Applicant has removed the language "and not with at least one unassociated document among multiple electronic documents."

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shuping et al (US 6,313,855) in view of Carter (US 2003/0052920), and in further view of Day et al (US 2002/0154159). These rejections are rendered moot by the above amendments but the Applicant is not conceding that the rejections have merit. Nevertheless, Applicant provides the following comments on differences between the present subject matter and the prior art of record.

The claims as amended recite subject matter that includes an input control having a user selectable command that 1) identifies the other electronic document, 2) identifies the intrinsic association that has previously been defined by stating which of the selected electronic document

and the other electronic document is a follow up of the other, and that 3) upon selection causes a view of the other electronic document that is intrinsically associated with the selected electronic document to be displayed on the graphical user interface, the input control displayed separately from the selected electronic document in the graphical user interface and configured for being used with any of multiple electronic documents displayed in the graphical user interface. Thus, the input control recited in the present claims is a useful and convenient tool for handling follow-up documents. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest such an input control.

Shuping is taken as characterized in Applicant's response to a previous office action. The Examiner conceded that Shuping fails to expressly teach that a user-selectable command should be displayed that identifies the intrinsic association; the types of intrinsic associations; stating which document is a follow up, and the input control (Office action pages 4-5). Additionally, Shuping does not disclose or suggest a user-selectable command that identifies the electronic document.

Carter is taken as characterized in Applicant's response to a previous office action. The Examiner states that Carter includes both a first and second intrinsic association corresponding to the later and earlier buttons, respectively (Office action page 5). The Applicant strongly disagrees with this characterization.

Carter nowhere discloses or suggests intrinsic associations between documents. Take, for example, the emails that Carter discusses with regard to Figure 2B. Carter searches these in terms of their respective dates. That is, when navigating from one email using Carter's system (e.g., from the 9:35 email) one might arrive at another email (e.g., the 10:15 one) that is entirely unrelated. And Carter does not describe anything about the navigation bar keeping track of documents that are follow ups of each other, because the Carter bar has no such functionality. That is, Carter describes the retrieval of arbitrary documents corresponding to a search query that can be entered using the earlier and later buttons. In other words, contrary to the Examiner's position, the earlier and later buttons do not provide documents according to an intrinsic association, but documents according to the current search query as provided by the Carter bar.

It follows that Carter does not disclose or suggest identification of the intrinsic association (whether in a user-selectable command or otherwise), the types of intrinsic associations (e.g., one document being a follow up of the other), an input control stating which document is a follow up (because no such follow up exists), or the input control having such a user-selectable command that identifies the electronic document.

Day discloses a browser for associating successive repointing of a browser's load function with navigational links in web pages (Title). In particular, in reference to FIGS. 4A and 4B, "the web browser scans for key phrases or words in links, such as "next," "previous," "more," and "back." The browser may scan the link text, uniform resource locators, graphic filenames, and alt text associated with graphics. When a "next" or "previous" page link is identified, the browser may automatically reposition the mouse cursor over the link. The browser may also automatically assign keyboard shortcuts to next and previous links" (Paragraph 36).

However, Day does not disclose or suggest a user selectable command that identifies the electronic document. That is, the electronic document (i.e., a web page) corresponding to the "next" or "previous" command is purposefully obscured from a user until after the "next" or "previous" command is selected.

Accordingly, the references fail to teach or suggest the present input control. The present subject matter of claim 1 is therefore not disclosed or rendered unpatentable even by the combination of Shuping, Carter, and/or Day. The other independent claims 12 and 14 include similar language and are therefore also patentable over the combined references. The dependent claims are patentable at least in view of their dependencies.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant submits that the claims 1-20 are in condition of allowance, and request favorable consideration of these claims.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above

may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 21, 2008

/s. richard soderberg reg. no. 43,352/

J. Richard Soderberg

Reg. No. 43,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
60 South Sixth Street  
Suite 3300  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 335-5070  
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696